

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated August 9, 2004 has been received and carefully studied.

The Examiner objects to the Abstract because it includes the word "comprising". By the accompanying amendment, the Abstract has been corrected as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner objects to claims 8-10 due to certain informalities. By the accompanying amendment, claim 8 has been cancelled, thereby rendering the objection moot.

The Examiner rejects claims 1 and 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Luk, U.S. Patent Publ. No. 2002/0181231. The Examiner states that Luk discloses a light source system comprising LEDs D1-D8 with different light emitting color arranged at a predetermined ratio of quantity of LEDs positioned at each curved configuration formed on the LED support, and that the ratio of the quantities of LEDs D1-D8 is based on the light emitting status of each diode of each color and quantity of diodes for a projected light of predetermined chromaticity. The Examiner also rejects claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Luk, and claims 8 and 9 as being unpatentable over Luk in view of Tait et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,598,994. Tait et al. is cited for its disclosure of an illumination system including a light guiding means 70 guiding the light from each of the LEDs.

By the accompanying amendment, claim 1 has been amended to include limitations of original claims 2 and 10. Claims 2 and 10 have been cancelled. Neither Luk alone, nor the combination of Luk and Tait et al. disclose or suggest the light source

system as now claimed.

The Examiner's indication that claim 10 contains allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Kevin S. Lemack  
Reg. No. 32,579  
176 E. Main Street - Suite 7  
Westboro, Massachusetts 01581  
TEL: (508) 898-1818